

Appl. No. 10/700,810  
Atty. Docket No. CM2707ML  
Amdt. Dated 06/08/2006  
Reply to Office Action of 03/09/2006  
Customer No. 27752

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 27 to 33 are currently being considered. Claims 1-4, 10-13, 15-17, 19 and 27-31 have been withdrawn as they are directed to a non-elected species. Claim 27 is being amended to require the composition comprise at least one enzyme. Support for inclusion of an enzyme may be found in, at a minimum, Page 24 lines 17 to 25. Claim 33 is being added. Support for new Claim 33 can be found in, at a minimum, Page 24 lines 17 to 25. No additional claim fee is believed due.

### Restriction Requirement Confirmation of Provisional Election of Group II (Claims 27-33)

#### without Traverse

In the instant Office Action, Applicants provisional election without traverse of group II is noted. Applicants are confirming this provisional election without traverse of group II. Consequently, Claims 1-4, 10-13, 15-17, 19 and 27-31 are withdrawn, from further consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. Claims 27 to 33 are currently pending.

### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

#### a) US 6,638,527 (Gott)

Claims 27-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) over US 6,638,527 (hereafter Gott) for reasons of record at pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection to the extent it may apply to the claims as now amended.

Gott relates to dry cleansing product having improved latherability and wet flexibility. Gott does not teach a liquid laundry detergent. Furthermore, Gott does not teach the addition of one or more enzymes.

Since Gott fails to teach each and every element of the present invention, Gott cannot be held to have anticipated the present invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Additionally, Gott provides no suggestion or motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Gott dry cleansing products to form a liquid laundry detergent or to include one or more enzymes.

Appl. No. 10/700,810  
Attr. Docket No. CM2707ML  
Amdt. Dated 06/08/2006  
Reply to Office Action of 03/09/2006  
Customer No. 27752

As to new Claim 33, Gott as noted above, is wholly silent as to enzymes, let alone proteases, amylases, cellulases, mannanase, endoglucanase, lipase and mixtures thereof. There is simply no disclosure of these claim elements of Claim 33 in Gott.

Since Gott fails to teach all the elements of amended Claim 27, and consequently dependent Claims 28-33 it does not anticipate the pending claims and therefore it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

b) US 5,747,435 (Patel)

Claims 27-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) over US 5,747,435 (hereafter Patel) for reasons of record at page 4 of the Office Action.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection to the extent it may apply to the claims as now amended.

Patel relates to mild "2-in-1" liquid conditioning personal care compositions. Patel does not teach a liquid laundry detergent. Furthermore, Patel does not teach the addition of one or more enzymes.

Since Patel fails to teach each and every element of the present invention, Patel cannot be held to have anticipated the present invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Additionally, Patel provides no suggestion or motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Patel mild "2-in-1" liquid conditioning personal care compositions to form a liquid laundry detergent or to include one or more enzymes.

As to new Claim 33, Patel as noted above, is wholly silent as to enzymes, let alone proteases, amylases, cellulases, mannanase, endoglucanase, lipase and mixtures thereof. There is simply no disclosure of these claim elements of Claim 33 in Patel.

Since Patel fails to teach all the elements of amended Claim 27, and consequently dependent Claims 28-33, it does not anticipate the pending claims and therefore it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

c) US 5,302,322 (Birtwistle)

Claims 27-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) over US 5,302,322 (hereafter Birtwistle) for reasons of record at pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action.

Appl. No. 10/700,810  
Atty. Docket No. CM2707ML  
Amdt. Dated 06/08/2006  
Reply to Office Action of 03/09/2006  
Customer No. 27752

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection to the extent it may apply to the claims as now amended.

Birtwistle relates to clear or opaque hair care compositions containing quaternary silicones. Birtwistle does not teach a liquid laundry detergent. Furthermore, Birtwistle does not teach the addition of one or more enzymes.

Since Birtwistle fails to teach each and every element of the present invention, Birtwistle cannot be held to have anticipated the present invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Additionally, Birtwistle provides no suggestion or motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Birtwistle cleansing compositions to form a liquid laundry detergent or to include one or more enzymes.

As to new Claim 33, Birtwistle as noted above, is wholly silent as to enzymes, let alone proteases, amylases, cellulases, mannanase, endoglucanase, lipase and mixtures thereof. There is simply no disclosure of these claim elements of Claim 33 in Birtwistle.

Since Birtwistle fails to teach all the elements of amended Claim 27, and consequently dependent Claims 28-33 it does not anticipate the pending claims and therefore it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

d) US 6,743,760 (Hardy)

Claims 27-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) over US 6,743,760 (hereafter Hardy) for reasons of record at page 5 of the Office Action.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection to the extent it may apply to the claims as now amended.

Hardy relates to transparent cleansing/conditioning shampoos. Hardy does not teach a liquid laundry detergent. Furthermore, Hardy does not teach the addition of one or more enzymes.

Since Hardy fails to teach each and every element of the present invention, Hardy cannot be held to have anticipated the present invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Additionally, Hardy provides no suggestion or motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Hardy transparent cleansing/conditioning shampoos to form a liquid laundry detergent or to include one or more enzymes.

Appl. No. 10/700,810  
Attr. Docket No. CM2707ML  
Amdt. Dated 06/08/2006  
Reply to Office Action of 03/09/2006  
Customer No. 27752

As to new Claim 33, Hardy as noted above, is wholly silent as to enzymes, let alone proteases, amylases, cellulases, mannanase, endoglucanase, lipase and mixtures thereof. There is simply no disclosure of these claim elements of Claim 33 in Hardy.

Since Hardy fails to teach all the elements of amended Claim 27, and consequently dependent Claims 28-33 it does not anticipate the pending claims and therefore it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest effort to place their application in proper form and to distinguish their invention from the applied prior art.

WHEREFORE, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments presented, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102, and allowance of Claims 27-33.

Respectfully Submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By Ian Robinson

Ian S. Robinson  
Registration No. 43,348  
(513) 627-4959

Date: June 8, 2006  
Customer No. 27752